

**NH Advisory Committee on Fire Protection,  
Meeting Minutes, November 8, 2006**

Members Present: Lawrence Thibodeau, Rob Farley, Rob Musil, Chris Burns, Jerry McCarthy, Richard Giguere, Len Daniels and John Mooney

Lawrence Thibodeau called the meeting to order.

The following errors in the September Meeting Minutes were brought to light:

- 1) Page 3 of the September Minutes, last sentence of Rob Farley's statement should read "The ECBA, New Hampshire Alarm Association or NHAA can get involved with a city or town if they choose to adopt our work."
- 2) Page 2 of the October Minutes last sentence of top paragraph should read "After discussion, it was agreed to leave 1204.01(a)(1) in its original form"
- 3) Page 2 of October's Minutes bottom of page should read "1204.02(a)7 (a) (1)"
- 4) Page 3 of October's Minutes section "Lawrence Thibodeau recognized Steve Rancourt: Regarding 1204.02 (a) 7 (a) (1), the ECBA..."
- 5) Page 5 October Minutes top of page "1203.01(d)5 was discussed next:"
- 6) Page 6 October Minutes "Steve Mango: Would like to see 1203.01 (d) 5 (a) be stricken and have requirements..."
- 7) Page 5 October Minutes: "Steve Mango spoke at length about 1204.04 (a)(7) (a) and (b)..."

These errors will be amended and new September and October Minutes will be sent out to the Committee members.

Chris Burns then addressed 1201.02 (B) (5). He inquired why this section on exemptions for electricians would be deleted. He said it was his and the ECBA's understanding that this exemption was approved by the Electricians Licensing Board and that it was inserted to move the proposal along. He realizes that the 'exemption' needs to be cleaned up but first he would like to meet with Steve Mango the NH Alarm Association representative to recast some definitions.

Rob Farley: Said the inclusion of this exemption was a typographical oversight on his part and that he originally inserted it when former Committee member Tom Malley said there were discussions in the electrician community about exemptions. Rob stated that he put it in the document as a 'place holder' until it could be discussed by the Committee. In any event, he said that this language is more suitable elsewhere in the document but not in the introductory section. He reiterated that the Fire Marshals Office does not want blanket exemptions but prefers that common ground be found between the alarm and electrical disciplines and placed further down in the document.

Lawrence Thibodeau: Agrees with Rob Farley as 1201.02 deal with government services.

**NH Advisory Committee on Fire Protection,  
Meeting Minutes, November 8, 2006**

Chris Burns: Agrees and knows that the wording needs to be reworked. He reiterated the need to get with Steve Mango. He would like to recast some of the definitions with Steve and present them to the Committee. He is thinking specifically of these definition changes:

- a) Installer: This is an example of what an electrician does as he works off designs
- b) Technician: Is currently well defined if the 'designer' end is taken out
- c) Designer: Should be separated out as this involves more engineering

Lawrence Thibodeau: We all can agree that something needs to be inserted and/or deleted and he repeated his hope that the Alarm and Electrician representatives can work out their differences as this is the major stumbling block to the Committee completing its work and this standoff has been going on for more than four months.

Chris Burns: Would like to have the chance to meet with Steve Mango and have an answer by next Fridays (November 17) meeting before the exemption is deleted. Chris then asked if there was ever a vote to delete the exemption.

Rob Farley: "No. Because it was an editorial insert serving as a placeholder."

Chris Burns: "Can we keep it for the time being?"

Lawrence Thibodeau: "We just need to move it."

Chris Burns: "It's still moving and I would like to have a vote next Friday after talking with Steve Mango."

Rob Farley: Saw no harm in taking it out since it will be somewhere else in the document.

Lawrence Thibodeau: "This has been a major stumbling block and if it's deleted from the introduction, it will not be forgotten."

Rob Farley: Maybe the Committee should vote on whether it stays or is deleted from the introduction.

Chris Burns: Then maybe the government agencies should also be deleted in 1205.02. Chris agrees that the exemption was editorial but it was also from the 2005 Electricians Licensing Board.

Rob Farley: Their board is not an oversight committee to this Committee. The Fire Marshal will be doing the oversight work here.

**NH Advisory Committee on Fire Protection**  
**Meeting Minutes, November 8, 2006**

Lawrence Thibodeau then called for a vote to strike section 1201.02 (b) (5) and have it reinserted elsewhere in the document.

***Voted to strike 1201.02 (b) (5) and have it reinserted elsewhere in the document in another form and language.***

Motion **passed** 4-3 with Rob Musil, Chris Burns and Jerry McCarthy voting against.

Lawrence Thibodeau repeated his earlier assertion that Chris Burns needs to get with Steve Mango and "Get it done". "It would be good to get this document completed by years end"

Lawrence Thibodeau then asked Chris Burns if ECBA has had any further discussions on insurance.

Chris Burns: "Yes" They would like to carry the same limits as is on the portable fire extinguishers (\$250000 combined single limits/\$500000 aggregate). If the Committee thinks that these limits should be raised, Chris felt that then there should be uniform insurance limits for all disciplines.

Len Daniels: The lower insurance limits for fire extinguishers were in deference to the small firms.

Chris Burns: "The same can be said about smaller electrical firms."

John Mooney: Explained that the difference between the insurance limits of a fire extinguisher firm and a fire suppression firm is because of the nature of a hazard being protected. A fire extinguisher is one used not to suppress a fire but to aid people in leaving a fire area. It's more like first aid. A fire suppression system is used to protect critical contents of a hazard area such as a main frame computer room for a bank or a switch room for a telecommunications firm. It is made to protect life and property and thus has a greater liability potential should it fail.

John felt the same could be said of large electrical contracting firms who may install alarm systems in large office complexes. No doubt they carry greater insurance than a one man electrical firm. These higher insurance limits affect the hourly cost per electrician and could be the difference between landing a job or losing it to an electrician with lower insurance limits. This is not about denying small firms this type of work but should they be allowed to work on such projects if they have inadequate insurance? It all comes down to what is in the public's best interest.

Lawrence Thibodeau: Has done research on electrician insurance limits in other states and he has found that they average \$500000 per occurrence and \$1000000 aggregate. Maybe the ECBA would like to revisit this.

**NH Advisory Committee on Fire Protection**  
**Meeting Minutes November 8, 2006**

Chris Burns then discussed the need for an individual having a high school diploma or a GED equivalent. He felt this was important but if an individual does not have one, maybe that person can be granted a 'grace period' until it could be acquired.

Rob Farley: He will bring information here on grace periods culled from what he has from other committees.

Rob then asked if 1207.01(c) is more of an editorial than a submission.

Lawrence Thibodeau: Felt that something needed to be put in there.

Lawrence Thibodeau then recognized Steve Rancourt of the ECBA:

Steve Rancourt: Felt that 1207.01 (c) need to be discussed to give the document more "bite". He hoped something definitive could be inserted in the future.

Len Daniels to Chris Burns: Will Chris and Steve also get together regarding the 144 hours of training?

Chris Burns: "Yes" He then told the Committee that what the 144 hours represents is  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the apprenticeship time.

Chris then asked Rob Farley where the document goes once it has been completed by the Committee.

Rob Farley: It goes to Marta for review and then to the Commissioner. After the Commissioner it will be reviewed by the JLCAR Attorneys. There will then be a comment period in the form of a Public Hearing and/or a Pre-public hearing. He recommended that this document have a Pre-public hearing in addition to the public hearing period.

It was requested by Steve Rancourt if Rob Farley could provide a website to get the Committee's Meeting Minutes. Rob responded by e-mail to John Mooney that he is working on it.

The next meeting will be Friday November 17 at 1pm to review changes in the document as well as to hear what has been worked out between the Alarm and Electrician representatives regarding:

- 1) The 144 hours of training
- 2) Insurance requirements
- 3) GED grace period
- 4) Reinsertion and rewording of electricians exemption

Len Daniels moved to adjourn the meeting and Richard Giguere seconded. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted...John Mooney, Secretary

